DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 066 SO 013 155

AUTHOR Brownstein, Henry H.: And Others
TITLE The Individual and Ethnic Identity: An Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Junior Coll. of Albany, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Ethnic Heritage Studies Branch.
PUB DATE Jul 80
GRANT G007903224
NOTE 46p.: For related documents, see SO 013 156-157.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ethnicity: *Ethnic Studies: Evaluation Methods: Higher Education: *Individual Characteristics: Instructional Materials: Secondary Education: Social Studies: *Student Attitudes: *Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Ethnic Heritage Studies Program

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of a student sourcebook which contains quotations of 51 individuals from varying ethnic backgrounds and with varying degrees of ethnicity is reported. The primary objective of the source book is to illustrate that people who identify with ethnic groups are individuals and not merely members of the group. Separate sections of the sourcebook focus on the processes of immigration and assimilation, individual ethnic identity, and ethnic group relations as they affect the individual. The book was introduced in seven classes in urban, and suburban/rural school districts and in a junior college. A limitation of the evaluation of this project was a result of time constraint. The one-year term of the project called for developing and evaluating materials: hence, teachers of experimental classes had to adjust the new material to their already existing class schedules. Both student and teacher evaluations were conducted. Generally, participating teachers reported that the individualistic approach of the sourcebook stimulated student thought and class discussion. Discussions of immigration and assimilation tended to excite students less than discussions of ethnic identity, prejudice, discrimination, and stereotypes. Students were evaluated according to pre- and posttest attitude scales. Results indicate that the use of the sourcebook can favorably change student attitudes, particularly at the middle school level. However, the findings are tentative because controls could not be maintained throughout the experiment. Appendices include the attitude scale and the questionnaire used to interview participants. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198066

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Henry H. Brownstein
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Individual and Ethnic Identity

An Evaluation Report

A Project of the
Junior College of Albany
Russell Sage College

Henry H. Brownstein,
Project Director

SP 013 155

A Final Program Performance Report Submitted to the
Office of Education, DHEW
August, 1980
Ethnic Heritage Studies Program, 1979-80
Grant Number G007903224
Program CFDA Number 13.549

The Individual and Ethnic Identity
An Ethnic Heritage Studies Project, 1979-80
The Junior College of Albany
Albany, New York

Program CFDA Number 13,549
Grant Number G007903224

Henry H. Brownstein, Ph.D.
Project Director and Principal Investigator

Lawrence J. Barnett, Ph.D.
Evaluation Specialist

Marlene Mendelson, M.A.
Project Assistant

Advisory Council

Dr. Alexinia Baldwin
Mrs. Gloria Bilynsky
Mr. Thomas Bushallow
Dr. Francis Femminella
Ms. Elaine Fraser
Miss Catherine Gaynor
Dr. Hannelore Lennig
Mr. Donald McGrath
Dr. Christopher Reaske
Mrs. Eleanor Rice
Mr. Victor Sgambato
Mrs. Christine Vasil
Dr. Steven Windmueller
Mr. Eugene Zmijewski

JoAnn Larson, Curriculum Consultant

Participating Teachers

Errol Fitzgerald, Algonquin Middle School
Arthur Foster, Doyle Middle School
Mary Beth Gosch, Troy High School
Donald McGrath, Averill Park High School
Henry H. Brownstein, The Junior College of Albany

Acknowledgements

All projects require the work of many people. I wish to thank some of those people who contributed to this one.

Members of the Advisory Council offered questions, concerns, and advise which helped to guide the project. The staff of the Sponsored Programs Office of Russell Sage College - Melissa Fountain, Darcy Oman, and Gail Kupferschmid - helped initially to create the project and then to keep it on course. The Superintendents of the participating school districts - Anthony Murray of the Enlarged City School District of Troy and Thomas E. Davis of Averill Park Central School District - opened their schools to us, allowing the Sourcebook to be tested. Then the participating teachers each showed what a good teacher can do when given new material to work with.

In preparing the new curriculum material for this project, particularly the Teachers' Guide, JoAnn Larson took the words of a Sociologist and translated them to the language spoken by teachers. Lawrence Barnett provided guidance, support, and his expertise as an evaluator to the analysis of the effectiveness of the project. Marlene Mendelson participated in every phase of the project.

And to all others who made this project possible, I thank you.

Henry H. Brownstein, Ph.D.
Albany, New York
July, 1980

Contents

Acknowlegements	ii
Introduction	2
Objectives, Methods, and Implementation of the Project	3
Evaluative Comments: Participating Teachers' Workshop	9
Evaluation of Attitude Change	17
Conclusions and Recommendations	28

Appendices

I. References	v
II. Dissemination Plan	vii
III. Attitudes Scale Items	viii
IV. Interview Schedule	ix
V. Related Papers	xiii

List of Tables

Table 1 - Difference of Means Between Pre- and Post-Test Attitude Scales - By School Level 21

Table 2 - Difference of Means Between Pre- and Post-Test Attitude Scales - By Individual Classes 24

Table 3 - Difference of Means Between Gain Scores of Experimental and Control Groups - By School Level 26

Table 4 - Difference of Means Between Gain Scores of Experimental and Control Groups - By Individual Classes 27

Introduction

As students in a multi-ethnic society begin to assume the adult roles of that society, they increasingly discover the need to associate, formally as well as informally, with others whose cultural backgrounds are different from their own. Given the social, economic, and cultural patterns of segregation in our own society and its institutions, including education, American students, as they become adults, are likely to be ill-equipped to deal with this cultural diversity. Through programs such as the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program, schools are attempting to prepare students for life in a culturally heterogeneous society.

The Individual and Ethnic Identity, an Ethnic Heritage Studies project, was designed specifically to provide a method and a resource for teaching students to appreciate the diversity of ethnic experiences in our society. To accomplish this end, a sourcebook of quotations from a variety of individuals interviewed about their own ethnic heritage and experience was prepared for classroom use. The unique feature of this sourcebook, and the method for its use as described in a companion teachers' guide, is its emphasis on the individual.

Traditionally, ethnicity has been defined by sociologists and anthropologists in objective terms. (e.g., Gordon, 1964; Naroll, 1964; Isaccs, 1975a) That is, ethnicity has been considered to be a quality of a given group which is recognized by group members and outsiders alike as being shared by the group's members. Such group qualities

are considered to be based on distinctions of race, religion, national origin, and so on. (e.g., Gordon, 1964, 1975; Isaacs, 1975b) If an individual is born into a particular group so defined, that individual is assumed to share certain qualitative charateristics with others born into that same group.

Given the objective definition of ethnicity, many educational projects designed to teach students about the ethnic experience in America tend to focus on ethnic groups as such. (e.g., Murray, 1977; Fraser, 1976; Gorena, 1972; The Chicago Consortium for Interethnic Curriculum Development, 1976) For example, The Chicago Consortium for Interethnic Curriculum Development focused on the contributions of the groups of the Consortium to American society and on the particular relationship of each group to its homeland. (1975:10) Similarly, Murray developed a curriculum package for high school students emphasizing the ethnic groups which settled in Rhode Island. (1977:18)

While the objective definition of ethnicity has alerted educators to the need for teaching about ethnic relations from the group perspective, more recent developments in social science are indicating to us a complementary need to emphasize the individual when teaching students about this subject area. Social scientists who study ethnicity are becoming increasingly interested in definitions which view it in subjective terms. (e.g., Weber, 1965; Shibutani and Kwan, 1965; Barth, 1969) In this sense, ethnicity becomes a personal interpretation of individuals as they relate themselves to particular ethnic realities, such as a group or a heritage. From this perspective, an understanding of ethnicity or ethnic relations requires an understanding of individuals who identify themselves or others in such a manner.

Efforts have been made by educators to develop teaching packages which consider the individual when teaching about ethnicity and ethnic relations. (e.g., Smith and Otero, 1977) But such developments tend to emphasize the individual primarily in terms of group membership. The Individual and Ethnic Identity as an educational project has uniquely developed a method and resource which exposes students to ethnicity and ethnic identity as phenomena which are personaly interpreted charateristics of individuals.

Since the focus of The Individual and Ethnic Identity as an educational project is on appreciating an understanding ethnicity through individuals who identify as ethnic in varying ways and in varying degrees, the evaluation of the project is necessarily a test of the effectiveness of the individualistic approach as a means of teaching students to appreciate and understand the concept and reality of ethnicity and ethnic relations. The Sourcebook, as it is prepared and implemented through this project, becomes an operational definition of the individualistic approach for testing this general hypothesis.

Objectives, Methods, and Implementation of the Project

As stated in the original project proposal, the objectives of The Individual and Ethnic Identity are as follows:

1. To teach students to understand the meaning of ethnicity in all its complexity, free of stereotypes.
2. To teach students that every person in America has an ethnic heritage.
3. To make students aware that all people who identify with ethnic groups are individuals, and not simply representatives of the group.

To measure the effectiveness of the project in achieving these objectives, teachers using the material in their own classes were asked to bring comments of their own and of their students to an evaluation workshop. Further, students using the material in these classes were given pre- and post-test attitude scales. (See Appendix III) Before considering the findings of these evaluative techniques, we need to discuss the implementation of the project to understand what it is that is being tested.

Early in the project, intensive interviews were conducted with fifty-one individuals of varying ethnic backgrounds and with varying degrees of ethnic identification. Respondents were selected specifically to represent such diversity. Though their ages ranged from fourteen to eighty-two, many individuals were included who were in their late teens and early twenties so that students using the material would be more likely to identify with them. Respondents were asked open-ended questions about their own identification, their family history, personal expressions, feelings, and thoughts about their identification and heritage, and questions about the meaning of that identification for themselves. They were also asked about their associations with others relative to their own ethnic identification. (See Appendix IV)

Once the interviews were completed, responses of those interviewed were organized in the form of a sourcebook for student use. The Sourcebook was written in the form of thought-provoking questions followed by quotations from the interviewed individuals which were intended to provide the student with insight useful in reaching conclusions relative to the questions. This format was incorporated in three sections, each with

two or three subsections as follows:

Section I. Immigration and Assimilation

A. Coming to America

B. Becoming an American

Section II. Your Own Ethnic Heritage

A. Knowing Your Ethnic Identity

B. Expressing Your Ethnic Identity

C. Feeling Your Ethnic Identity

Section III. Being Different

A. Prejudice

B. Discrimination

C. Stereotypes

Section I focuses on the processes of immigration and assimilation, Section II on individual ethnic identity, and Section III on ethnic group relations as they affect the individual.

Within each subsection of the Sourcebook, a number of questions were included to stimulate individual student thought and classroom discussion. Each question, or set of questions, was followed by a series of quotations which could help the student, with guidance from his or her teacher, to reach his or her own conclusions about the issue being raised by the question. For example, the following question and response are found in Section II (Being Different), part A (Prejudice).

Question: Can prejudice ever be reduced?

"...Where I went to school, they closed my high school down a few times because of race riots for weeks. If you were white at the time of the race riot, you were on my side. If you were black, you weren't on my side. But now that I'm out of high school, and into

college, it doesn't make that big of a difference. I have a lot of black friends now - now that I got out of high school. Going to school changes the way I thought and being away from that environment at the high school where it was pretty rough - it's changed me a lot. But I don't think it's changed the way they feel about me very much." (male, 21, German/Irish ancestry)

Such questions and quotations from respondents offer the student the opportunity to think about and discuss with his or her classmates issues of everyday life in a multi-ethnic society through the words and thoughts of other people who have had experiences similar to their own, or different from their own.

The completed Sourcebook was then tested in a variety of classroom situations. It was used by selected teachers in an urban school district (Troy High School and Doyle Middle School), a suburban/rural school district (Averill Park High School and Algonquin Middle School) and at the Junior College of Albany, all in New York State. The Sourcebook, and hence, the individualistic approach, was thus tested in a total of seven classes. The school situations were varied in this manner in order to evaluate the relative effectiveness of the use of the Sourcebook in terms of the variables of school level and location. Hypothetically, it was expected that students at the lower school levels would most likely be influenced by the Sourcebook material as would students living in suburban or rural areas, assuming generally lower levels of personal interaction with members of ethnic groups other than their own. In each case, the Sourcebook was used, as intended, as a unit of lessons within an existing curriculum. In the high schools and middle schools, it was used with social studies classes, and at the Junior College it was used with a class called Ethnic and Minority Relations.

Though the Sourcebook was generally used as a means of stimulating classroom discussion and individual student thought about ethnicity from an individualistic perspective, formats of presentation varied. In four cases, the unit was used for a total of three class periods, in one case for four class periods, and in two cases for seven class periods. All but one teacher, who used the material in two middle school classes, comleted the entire Sourcebook. That teacher did not cover the first section on immigration and assimilation. Instead, he showed his classes a film about prejudice which was not developed by this project. The Junior College class, in addition to reading and discussing the sourcebook, spent one class period viewing a videotape, produced by the project, of excerpts from interviews with two groups of students. In one high school class, the teacher had his students discuss assigned sections of the sourcebook in small groups, each of which later reported back to the entire class. In terms of reading the quotations in the Sourcebook, students either skimmed through them during the class discussion, read them as homework assignments, or were given time during the class period to read them before they were discussed.

The variations in formats of presentation were both controlled and uncontrolled. For purposes of experimentation, an effort was made to control the formats of classroom presentation in two ways. First, teachers participating in this project met for two planning workshops prior to using the material to discuss the methods of implementation. Further, each teacher was provided with a guidebook which provided him or her with an explanation of the material in the Sourcebook, common definitions of terms used in the Sourcebook, and guidelines for classroom use of the material. Ideally, variations in the number of class periods of use would have occurred only within school levels. In terms of actual usage, variations

in the styles of use, such as skimming versus classroom reading time or homework assignments, would similarly have been limited to school levels. In addition, all classes would have used the entire sourcebook, each would have been exposed to the videotaped interviews, and none would have been exposed, during the experiment, to materials not developed by the project. If such were the case, an experiment could have been conducted which would measure the relative effectiveness of given formats of presentation.

In practice, the control of the variations in formats of presentation was limited. The constraints of a one-year project designed both to develop and evaluate new curriculum materials contributed to an inability to maintain the necessary standards for true experimentation. The material had to be developed first before it could be tested in actual classroom settings. Fifty interviews had to be arranged and conducted and then a sourcebook had to be written incorporating the interviews. The participating classes, obviously, could not arrange their yearly schedules around a single experiment. Therefore, the use of the material had to be fit to existing classroom schedules. This, for example, explains why two middle school classes did not use Section I of the Sourcebook and why several of the classes had discussed the topics of Section I earlier in the school year.

An additional problem resulted from a combination of the limitations of time and the fact that the requirements of experimentation were not strongly enough stressed at the teachers' workshops. At the second teachers' workshop, which was designed to organize the experiment by discussing formats of presentation with the teachers, teachers were asked to allow for as great an amount of time as possible between the administrations of the pre- and post-test attitude scales. At the same time, they generally expressed their concern that, given existing class schedules, it

would be difficult to give more than a few periods of class time to the use of the new material. The consequence was that in a few cases, the teachers, trying to follow the instructions given them at the workshop, had intervals between their administration of the pre- and post-test attitude scales which far exceeded the actual time of classroom use of the material.

As a result of the uncontrolled variations in the formats of presentation of the Sourcebook material, the findings of the experiment using attitude scales to measure the effectiveness of the individualized approach of the Sourcebook (to be discussed later in this report) are tentative. Nonetheless, the participating teachers met after all classes had completed their use of the Sourcebook for an Evaluation Workshop. They met to discuss the formats of presentation actually used by each class. In addition, they discussed their own impressions of the Sourcebook and its use in their classes. Their reports at this workshop provide some measure of the effectiveness of the material in themselves.

Evaluative Comments: Participating Teachers' Workshop

At the evaluation workshop, participating teachers met with the project director, project assistant, and a curriculum consultant. Topics discussed included the actual format of presentation in each class, general responses of teachers and students, and particular events which occurred while the material was being used that were indicative of success in teaching students to appreciate and understand ethnicity and ethnic relations from the individualistic perspective.

Generally, participating teachers reported favorable responses among their students to the material in the Sourcebook and its use in their

classes. Some such comments indicated simply that their students enjoyed the project. For example:

> "I enjoyed the project and the kids did, too. They liked the book very much. (Students agreed) that everybody in the eighth grade should read this book." (Doyle Middle School)
>
> "They seemed to like it." (Algonquin Middle School)
>
> "The kids really liked it." (Averill Park High School)
>
> "They loved the last quote.... a fitting ending." (Troy High School)

Other comments from the teachers which similarly indicated a favorable response among their students to the Sourcebook and its use were directly relevant to the ability of the individualized approach to stimulate student thought and class discussion. These included:

> "(Students were) pretty enthusiastic in their discussion, particularly in the last section. They came out with their own ideas and their own criticisms. They enjoyed identifying with the respondents." (Troy High School)
>
> "(The students) got off on different topics, like the 'shanty Irish' and the 'lace-curtain Irish.'" (Averill Park High School)
>
> "Generally, the discussions were good because many students gave their own examples and the quotes acted, as they were intended, primarily as a stimulant." (Junior College of Albany.)

When comments from teachers about their students' responses were negative, they tended to be related to a particular problem of teaching a different kind of material or to a desire to see things included in the Sourcebook which were not. For example:

> "It was hard to get students to distinguish an intellectual from an emotional issue." (Troy High School)

"(Students noted) there were no interviews with American Indians." (Averill Park High School)

In general, however, the participating teachers all agreed that the individualized approach of the Sourcebook was especially useful in stimulating student thought and class discussion about ethnicity and ethnic relations.

In terms of the ability of the individualistic approach, through the use of the Sourcebook, to stimulate student thought and class discussion about ethnicity and ethnic relations, the general consensus of the teachers was the the later sections of the Sourcebook were most successful. That is, discussions of immigration and assimilation tended to excite students less than discussions of ethnic identity and of prejudice, discrimination, and stereotypes. This is not surprising for several reasons. First, it was expected that students would need time to adjust to an unusual type of material before class discussion could become lively. Further, because the material developed by a one-year project cannot always be ready to coincide with a given teacher's planning for the same year, several of the participating classes had already discussed the topic of immigration in the normal course of their social studies curriculum. But perhaps most important, the section about immigration and assimilation is more cognitive in orientation than the other sections. Though the primary emphasis of the project is to influence the students affectively, the more cognitive nature of Section I is not necessarily a problem. In all cases, teachers agreed that the section dealing with immigration and assimilation served as a background to a better understanding of the material of the later sections.

Beginning with the section about ethnic identity, Section II, there

were more cases observed by teachers indicating an influence on student thought and class discussion. For example, in one of the urban high school classes, the teacher recalled a case in which a particular student took issue with an ethnic classification in the Sourcebook, raised the question for class discussion, and ultimately had his own opinion changed. In this instance, a Jewish student complained that since Judaism is a religion, being Jewish is not an ethnic identity. He could not imagine a comparison of Jews to immigrants from other nations. After a lively class discussion of the question, he raised his hand, and said, "I take it all back." This led to further class discussion of the meaning of ethnic identity.

In the Junior College class, the section of the Sourcebook about ethnic identity similarly stimulated student thought and class discussion. The first question of the section asks students to consider, from the quotations that follow, reasons for identifying with an ethnic heritage. Almost immediately, one student pointed to a quotation in which the respondent indicated that, in part, he identifies as Polish because he has a Polish-sounding name. The student's belief that this explanation was inadequate led the class to a discussion of ethnic identity formation. Black students, comprising about 50 percent of all students in the class, began to focus on their own problems of ethnic identity. One girl argued that American society had made it difficult for her to identify as a black person. She, and others, noted the destruction of African roots by slavery and social pressures to change from a Negro to an Afro-American to a black identity. In this, and the previously noted classroom experience, the Sourcebook did what it was intended to do. It stimulated students to think about and discuss issues of the ethnic experience in America

which are relevant to their own identities. In terms of the stated objectives of the project, students were thinking about and classes were discussing the meaning of ethnicity and the notion that all people in America have their own ethnic heritages.

According to the participating teachers, the individualized approach of the Sourcebook developed by this project also encouraged students to think about and discuss issues of prejudice, discrimination, and stereotypes in such a way as to make them at least consider that their biases about ethnic group relations might be inaccurate. For example, in an almost all-white eighth grade class in an urban middle school, students became excited by the words of a 31 year-old woman, quoted several times in the Sourcebook, who is married to a black man. Without exception, students argued against intermarriage. Calling it "the worst time I've experienced in twenty years," the teacher of that class still saw this as an opportunity for an important learning experience. The students apparently agreed. At the beginning of the next class, the students said to the teacher, "We have a few questions for you." As anticipated, they asked him, "What would you do if your son or daughter brought home a black person to marry? Have you ever kissed a black woman?" To their disbelief, he answered, "nothing" to the first question, and "yes" to the second. "It's funny," he later said at the evaluation workshop, "at the end of our discussion we had a review of this stuff and they (the students) would readily admit that, 'I guess it really doesn't matter as long as the person is a good individual.' But the consensus of the class was that the couple that was mentioned would some time down the road have a difficult time and the marriage would break up." (This particular couple has been married, at present, for more than thirteen years.) The im-

portant point here is not whether the issue was resolved, but rather that the question was raised among students in the process of forming their own values relative to other people.

In the same eighth grade class, another experience forced the students to think directly about the affects of prejudice. In this case, the Sourcebook acted indirectly to point to a situation of prejudice existing in the students' own class. Discussing the quotations about prejudice in the Sourcebook, the teacher asked students if they had ever been the victims of prejudice. He turned to a boy of Japanese ancestry. He knew that the other students "don't do it intentionally, but they do give him the heat." Asked this question, the boy said that he had felt it in some situations. The teacher asked him about his present class. "This is the worst I ever had," he said. What followed was "dead silence." In this case, students were forced to confront the existence of prejudice on a very personal level.

In one of the urban high school classes, the section of the Sourcebook dealing with prejudice, discrimination, and stereotypes similarly led to the greatest amount of thought and discussion on the part of the students. For example, a student who identified himself as white, Irish, and the product of a white neighborhood, said to the class, "I had no idea what it feels like to be discriminated against. Reading these quotes really surprised me." Though this does not necessarily mean that he will begin to deal with others differently, it does indicate, as his teacher pointed out, that "at least an awareness is being raised." In a similar way, discussions of stereotypes in this class led students to think about and discuss the diversity of personal expressions of individuals in any given ethnic group. Both of these outcomes are indicative of success relative to the objectives of this project.

Given that the teachers at the Evaluation Workshop had actually used The Individual and Ethnic Identity: A Sourcebook for Students with their own classes, they were asked for comments about the Sourcebook in particular and about the individualized approach in general. About the Sourcebook itself, their comments included:

> "(There was) a good variety of quotations in the Sourcebook. It is pretty flexible. We used it in all different ways." (Troy High School)
>
> "What I like about your material is that it's so immediate." (Averill Park High School)

Though the comments of participating teachers concerning the particular material offered to them by this Sourcebook are generally favorable, it is more important to know their thoughts about the individualized approach in general. Should other teachers adopt the individualized approach for their own classes, the quotations from this Sourcebook might not be relevant to the ethnic groups living in their geographical areas. They might find it more worthwhile to use the already developed Sourcebook as a model for their own. Therefore, the comments from the participating teachers about the individualized approach, which tended to be favorable, are significant. Such comments included:

> "Actually, it's a better way to teach immigration. This is a much better way of doing it." (Doyle Middle School)
>
> "(My students) enjoyed identifying with the respondents." (Troy High School)
>
> "By focusing on individuals and discussing individuals in the framework of a class discussion, students in my class seem to have become more open to the discussion of what might otherwise be

divisive issues." (Junior College of Albany)

The generally favorable opinion of the participating teachers toward the Sourcebook and the individualized approach is further supported by their comments concerning their desire to use the Sourcebook again. For example:

"I'd love to use this again." (Troy High School)

"I'll use it again." (Algonquin Middle School)

"I'm using it next year." (Doyle Middle School)

"I'm going to use it with what I have." (Averill Park High School)

As a group, then, the participating teachers demonstrated enthusiasm about the individualized approach of the Sourcebook.

In addition to their enthusiastic comments and satisfaction with the experiences of their classes in utilizing the individualistic approach, the teachers also made suggestions for deriving the most benefit from this approach. All teachers at the evaluation workshop agreed that the individualistic approach, presenting ideas to students through quotations from selected individuals, worked best when the examples of the quotations were used to develop concepts. For example, a more useful learning experience is provided to students when the quotations from people who have experienced discrimination are used to help students develop their own understanding of discrimination, than when discrimination is first explained to students in the abstract and then the quotations are used to support the established definition. Similarly, the teachers agreed that the individualistic approach is more useful when teaching values than when teaching facts. This is exemplified by the greater success teachers had when trying to stimulate student thought and class discussion with sections II and III of the Sourcebook.

What the teachers using <u>The Individual and Ethnic Identity: A</u>

Sourcebook for Students have indicated is that the individualistic approach serves as a stimulant to student thought and class discussion. This is particularly true on the affective level as opposed to the cognitive level. To test the affective influence of the individualistic approach on students, students using the Sourcebook completed Likert-type attitude scales before and after using the material.

Evaluation of Attitude Change

As a measure of attitude, Likert-type scales ask the individual whose attitude is being measured to respond to a series of statements, called items, with degrees of agreement or disagreement. Each of the items in the series is related to a particular objectified concept, the attitude towards which is being measured. The score of the individual, theoretically reflective of his or her attitude towards the given concept, is then determined by summing, or summing and averaging the scores of all the items in the scale. (Kerlinger, 1973:496) For purposes of measuring the attitudes of students exposed to the individualistic perspective of the Sourcebook on ethnic identity, a Likert-type scale measuring individual attitude towards ethnic and minority groups was utilized. (See Appendix III.)

The attitude scale for this experiment was adapted from a scale used by Kleg to measure attitudes toward race. (1970) Items from Kleg's scale were modified to reflect attitudes toward ethnic and minority groups in general. Of the total eighty items developed by Kleg, twenty were selected for inclusion. Since Likert-type scales are summated rating scales, it is reasonable to assume that each item of the scale is of equal "attitude value" and hence, any subset of items is, at least in theory, the same as any other subset or as the whole set. (Kerlinger, 1973:496)

In order to determine whether or not the use of the individualized approach, as operationalized in the Sourcebook on ethnic identity, in fact changed the attitudes toward ethnic groups of those students exposed to this treatment, two Likert-type scales were needed; one had to be administered before exposure and one had to be administered after exposure. Kleg provided two such scales. The first included eighty items and the second thirty-five of the original eighty. Though the use of two different scales for pre- and post-exposure evaluation is theoretically acceptable with summated rating scales, a threat to the internal validity of the experiment due to the use of different instruments of measurement, called "instrumentation" (Campbell and Stanley, 1963:9), can be lessened by using the same scale for both administrations. Therefore, for this experiment, the scale used for the post-test consisted of the same items as that used for the pre-test. However, to lessen the threat to the internal validity of the experiment created by the effects of having completed the first scale on the students' scores on the post-treatment adminstration, called "testing" (Campbell and Stanley, 1963:5), the twenty items of the pre-test were re-ordered for the post-test.

In order to determine the significance of any change found in students' attitudes as measured by the pre-and post-exposure attitude scales, it would be most useful to similarly administer the same scales to randomly selected groups of students not exposed to the individualistic approach of the Sourcebook. (e.g., Campbell and Stanley, 1963:13; Oppenheim, 1966:17) However, it was not possible for this experiment to assign students randomly to experimental and control groups. Existing classes in a given school cannot easily be disrupted for the sake of experimentation. Therefore, each teacher using the Sourcebook with a particular class sel-

ected another class which he or she believed was similar in student composition and then administered the pre-and post-test attitude scales to the students of that class, on the same days that they were administered to the students using the Sourcebook, without exposing these students to the individualistic perspective of the Sourcebook. In this way, each experimental group could be compared to a "matched" control group. (Oppenheim, 1966:18)

To test the relationship of the use of the individualized approach and students' attitudes toward ethnic and minority groups, a common procedure of educational research (Kerlinger, 1973; Campbell and Stanley, 1963), testing for the statistical significance of the difference between the mean scores of the pre- and post-tests, was used. Should a difference be found between pre- and post-test scores among students who were exposed to the experimental treatment, it could then be compared to any difference found between the pre- and post-test scores of a similar group of students not exposed to the treatment. If the difference observed is statistically significant for the experimental group and not for the control group, this would suggest that the experimental treatment in fact had the intended effect on student attitudes.

Due to the constraints of a one-year project, the use of the Sourcebook on ethnic identity, and hence, of the individualized approach to this subject area, had to be adapted to already existing class schedules. This is a particularly important problem for a program of instruction designed to affect student attitudes. Teachers participating in the experiment had to arrange to use the Sourcebook and its approach when it became available to them and not necessarily when it was most suitable to their own planning. As a result, the actual classroom use of the Sourcebook in the

experimental classes was limited to a range of from three to seven days, while the interval between the administration of the pre- and post-test attitude scales ranged from five to twenty-one days. (See Table 2) Given that attitudes tend to be "fairly stable" (Brannon, 1976:151), it may be assumed that the likelihood of changing them is a function of time. Therefore, the small amount of time which teachers could devote to the use of the Sourcebook probably decreased its affect on students' attitudes. (With the narrow range of time in the classroom use of the material, this could not be tested with the available data.)

To determine the school level or levels at which the individualized approach to the study of ethnic identity would be most useful in affecting the attitudes of students toward ethnic and minority groups, the experiment was conducted with classes at the middle school, high school, and junior college levels. Hypothetically, if attitudes toward minority groups begin early and develop gradually (Horowitz, 1965:118), then it should be easier to change the attitudes of students at the lower grade levels. That is, we would expect attitude change to be most likely to occur among students at the middle school level.

Individual scores on the Likert-type attitude scales were coded so that a higher score would indicate a less favorable attitude toward ethnic and minority groups in general and a lower score would indicate a more favorable attitude toward ethnic and minority groups in general. Therefore, if the individualized approach of the Sourcebook in fact changes the attitudes of a group of students in the direction of having them relate more favorably to ethnic and minority groups, then the mean (average) of their scores on the post-test should be lower than the mean of their scores on the pre-test. A t-test was used to determine the

statistical significance of the difference between the mean scores on the two tests for the different classes and for different categories of students.

Table 1, below, presents the t-value and probability level of statistical significance of the difference of means between the pre- and post-test scores for experimental groups at each of the school levels being studied for all experimental classes combined, and for the respective control group categories. (Since established classes at selected school levels, rather than randomly selected groups of students, were used in the experiment, there is no reason not to combine classes for purposes of evaluation.)

DIFFERENCE OF MEANS BETWEEN PRE- AND POST- TEST ATTITUDE SCALES

BY SCHOOL LEVEL

SCHOOL LEVEL	N OF CASES	T-VALUE	PROBABILITY LEVEL
ALL			
Experimental	158	-2.21	0.014
Control	130	-0.28	0.389
Middle School			
Experimental	64	-2.63	0.006
Control	52	-0.51	0.308
High School			
Experimental	77	-0.15	0.440
Control	58	-0.19	0.425
Junior College			
Experimental	17	-0.69	0.251
Control	20	0.52	0.306

Table 1

A comparison of experimental and control categories shows that at the 0.05 level of significance, the difference between the means on the pre- and post-test scores is significant when all experimental classes are combined. That is, for all the experimental classes combined, it may be concluded that the use of the individualized approach of the Sourcebook had the general effect of changing students' attitudes toward ethnic and minority groups in a positive (favorable) direction. In this sense, it could be argued that the individualized approach had the effect of reducing ethnic prejudice among students generally.

Further examination of Table 1 shows that the difference between the mean scores on the pre- and post-test is likewise statistically significant for the middle school level (combined), but not for the high school nor the junior college levels. This is consistent with the hypothesis presented earlier. It was expected that change would more likely occur at the middle school level. However, when a similar t-value is computed for each experimental class and its matching control group, as presented in Table 2, it appears that a statistically significant change did not occur in all middle school classes, and did not occur only in middle school classes. In fact, a statistically significant difference in mean attitude scale scores in the direction favorable to ethnic and minority groups is found for only one of the three experimental middle school classes and is also found for one of the three experimental high school classes. In no case is a statistical significance found for the difference of mean scores for any of the control groups.

Of the three experimental middle school classes, a statistically significant change in attitude scale scores was found for one of the middle school classes from Algonquin Middle School of suburban/rural Averill Park. However, since this class did not use the section of the Source-

book on immigration (which was noted earlier as the section with a cognitive rather than affective orientation) and added a film which was not part of the project, it is difficult to determine whether or not the observed change in attitude scale scores is truly due to the influence of the individualized approach. The fact that a statistically significant difference between the means of the pre- and post-test attitude scale scores was not found for any other middle school class could indicate that it is not the individualized approach which was responsible for the observed change in scale scores which did occur in the Algonquin class. However, with uncontrolled variations in the experimental conditions (discussed earlier), any analysis of these findings must be tentative.

On the high school level,statistical significance is found in the difference of the mean scores of the pre- and post-tests for one class from Averill Park High School. The class for which this change is observed is a class with a higher academic (Regents) level as compared to the Averill Park High School class for which no statistically significant change was observed. Interestingly, the experimental class from Troy High School, also a Regents level class, shows a statistically significant change in mean scores as well. However, in this latter case, the change is in the unintended direction. The mean score of the post-test was higher than the mean score of the pre-test. But it would be difficult to say that this unfavorable change occurred as a result of the use of the individualized approach. As indicated in Table 2, the Troy High School class used the Sourcebook for only three days, while 21 days elapsed between administration of the pre- and post-test attitude scales. Any number of events independent of the use of the Sourcebook and its

DIFFERENCE OF MEANS BETWEEN PRE- AND POST-TEST ATTITUDE SCALES

BY INDIVIDUAL CLASSES

CLASS	N OF CASES	T-VALUE	PROBABILITY LEVEL	NOTES ON USAGE
Algonquin Middle #1				3 days use
Experimental	23	-3.16	0.003	6 between scales
Control	17	-0.20	0.424	skipped Immigration section added film
Algonquin Middle #2				Same as #1
Experimental	18	-1.55	0.070	
Control	19	-0.28	0.391	
Doyle Middle				
Experimental	23	0.07	0.474	7 days use
Control	16	-1.07	0.151	11 between scales
Averill Park H.S.#1				3 days use
Experimental	26	-1.73	0.049	7 between scales
Control	25	-0.00	0.500	
Averill Park H.S.#2				3 days use
Experimental	22	-0.86	0.201	5 between scales
Control	18	-0.47	0.323	group work
Troy H.S. *				3 days use
Experimental	29	2.20	0.019	21 between scales
Control	15	0.49	0.314	some group work
Jr. College of Albany				7 days use
Experimental	17	-0.69	0.251	18 between scales
Control	20	0.52	0.306	videotaped interviews shown

*Though the difference of means in this case appears to be significant at the .05 level, it should be noted that the change in the average score from the pre- to the post-test is in a positive rather than the intended negative direction.

Table 2

individualized approach could have occurred during the period between testings which would have invalidated the observed change in mean attitude scale scores. (Campbell and Stanley, 1963:7)

For the junior college class, no statistically significant difference was observed. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis that attitude change would more likely occur at the lower grade levels. It could be argued that this result, or lack of result, is due to the fact that the junior college students were older than any of the other students participating in the project.

Since a simple comparison of experimental and matching control groups relative to t-values based on the pre-test to post-test change in scale scores (as we have done in Tables 1 and 2) does not statistically compare the experimental and control groups, it may be argued that a better measure of change in attitude scale scores is a comparison of the mean gain scores of the experimental and control groups. (e.g., Cambell and Stanley, 1963; Kerlinger, 1973) Gain scores refer to the observed difference in scores between the pre- and post-test. Table 3 reports the t-value and probability level for comparison of the mean gain scores of the experimental and respective control categories by school level and for all groups combined.

When all classes are combined, the difference between the mean gain scores of the experimental as compared to the control category is not statistically significant. Further, no statistical significance is found for the difference of mean gain scores between experimental and control categories when classes are combined by school level. Given the short amount of time that the Sourcebook was used in each of the experimental classes, these results are not surprising. They might, however,

DIFFERENCE OF MEANS BETWEEN GAIN SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

BY SCHOOL LEVEL

SCHOOL LEVEL	N OF CASES	MEAN GAIN SCORE	T-VALUE	PROBABILITY LEVEL
ALL			-1.20	0.126
Experimental	158	-0.0551		
Control	130	-0.0085		
Middle School			-1.36	0.089
Experimental	64	-0.1141		
Control	52	-0.0250		
High School *			0.08	0.469
Experimental	77	-0.0045		
Control	58	-0.0086		
Junior College			-0.87	0.194
Experimental	17	-0.0618		
Control	20	-0.0350		

*In this case it was found that the differences in sample variances should be assumed to reflect real differences in the corresponding populations, so the t-value and probability level are based on separate variance estimates. In all other cases, a pooled variance estimate is used.

Table 3

be a function of the limitations of experimental controls discussed earlier. If such is the case, then any conclusions drawn must be tentative. Nonetheless, it could be argued that despite earlier findings, the use of the

DIFFERENCE OF MEANS BETWEEN GAIN SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

BY INDIVIDUAL CLASSES

CLASS	N OF CASES	MEAN GAIN SCORE	T-VALUE	PROBABILITY LEVEL
Algonquin Middle #1			-1.74	0.045
Experimental	23	-0.2065		
Control	17	-0.0176		
Algonquin Middle #2			-1.35	0.093
Experimental	18	-0.1472		
Control	19	0.0237		
Doyle Middle			0.91	0.165
Experimental	23	0.0043		
Control	16	-0.0906		
Averill Park H.S. #1			-1.24	0.111
Experimental	26	-0.0865		
Control	25	-0.0000		
Averill Park #2 *			0.08	0.469
Experimental	22	-0.0455		
Control	18	-0.0556		
Troy H.S.			0.84	0.204
Experimental	29	0.1000		
Control	15	0.0333		
Jr. College of Albany			-0.87	0.194
Experimental	17	-0.0618		
Control	20	-0.0350		

* In this case it was found that the differences in sample variances should be assumed to reflect real differences in the corresponding populations, so the t-value and probability level are based on separate variance estimates. In all other cases, a pooled variance estimate is used.

Table 4

individualized approach of the Sourcebook on ethnic identity did not change students' attitudes toward ethnic and minority groups.

An examination of the difference between experimental and control group mean gain scores on a class by class basis, as presented in Table 4, demonstrates findings which may be interpreted as more favorable to the use of the individualized approach. A statistically significant difference between the mean gain scores of the experimental and control groups is found for the same middle school class for which such a difference was found when using the pre- to post-test difference scores. Though a definitive statement about the affect of the individualized approach on students' attitudes could not be made on this basis alone, such a finding is generally supportive of the hypothesis that the intented attitude change is most likely to occur among students at the middle school level. Still, that class in particular was one which did not fully adhere to the controls of the experiment. (See Table 2) Therefore, the conclusion based upon this finding is not as strong as it might otherwise have been.

Conclusions and Recommendations

It may reasonably be concluded that the classroom use of the individualized approach of the student Sourcebook on ethnic identity tends to stimulate student thought and class discussion. This is generally supported by all of the teachers who participated in the project, each of whom expressed a desire to use the Sourcebook again. According to these teachers, their students found the use of the Sourcebook enjoyable as well as educational.

In terms of affecting attitude change, the findings are not as

conclusive as those based on the teachers' impressions. Observations of statistically significant change for certain experimental groups in attitude scale scores from the pre- to the post-testing, and in one comparison of the mean gain scores of experimental and control groups, would seem to indicate, as hypothesized, that the use of the individualized approach of the Sourcebook on ethnic identity can favorable change student attitudes toward ethnic and minority groups in general, particularly at the middle school level. However, for reasons indicated in the analysis of these findings, conclusions based on these observations are tentative. The major reason for the uncertain nature of these findings is the fact that experimental controls could not be maintained throughout the experiment. Had the participating teachers been able to isolate the use of the Sourcebook and its individualized approach within the normal course of their annual curriculum planning, it might have been possible to have them adhere more closely to the strict demands of experimentation. If the material could have been developed and presented to the teachers during the academic year prior to its use with their classes, it might have been easier for them to prepare more adequate experimental conditions in their classrooms. For example, they might have arranged to devote more time to the use of the Sourcebook and to avoid teaching related topics prior to its use. Nonetheless, these findings are not discouraging.

In sum, the findings of the evaluation of The Individual and Ethnic Identity, an Ethnic Heritage Studies Program project involving the use of an approach focusing on individuals to teach students about ethnic groups and interethnic relations, are encouraging. Though we cannot be certain that the use of this approach as a single unit of a larger cur-

riculum will change students' attitudes, we can be sure that it has the potential to make them think about these topics and to discuss them with their classmates and teachers. This in itself is an important part of the educational process.

As noted earlier, the use of the individualized approach to the study of ethnic identity, ethnic groups and interethnic relations is offered as complementary to the traditional group orientation to such study. Though this report does not offer reason to abandon the group approach in favor of the individualized approach, it does strongly suggest that the individualized approach be incorporated into an existing curriculum which already focuses on groups. It is recommended that teachers of ethnic studies consider bringing individuals who identify in varying ways with various ethnic groups into their classrooms as individuals, in person or otherwise to stimulate their students to think about and discuss issues of ethnic identity, ethnic groups, and interethnic relations.

Appendices

I. References

Barth, Frederik
1969 "Introduction." Pp. 9-38 in F. Barth (ed.), Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Brannon, Robert
1976 "Attitudes and the Prediction of Behavior." Pp.145-98 in B. Seidenberg and A. Snadowsky (eds.), Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley
1963 Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Chicago Consortium for Interethnic Curriculum Development
1976 Ethnic Heritage in America, Teacher's Manual: Curriculum Materials in Elementary School Social Studies on Greeks, Jews, Lithuanians, and Ukrainians. Chicago: Chicago Consortium.

Fraser, Lowrie
1976 Ethnic Heritage Studies, 1975-76. Final Report. Research and Evaluation Report X (October): Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia.

Gordon, Milton M.
1964 Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.
"Toward a General Theory of Racial and Ethnic Groups." Pp. 84-110 in N. Glazer and D. Moynihan (eds.), Ethnicity-Theory and Experience. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gorena, Minerva
1972 Information and Materials to Teach the Cultural Heritage of the Mexican-American Child. Austin, Texas: Education Service Center, Region 13.

Horowitz, Eugene L.
1965 "Development of Attitude Toward Negroes." Pp. 111-21 in H. Proshansky and B. Seidenberg (eds.), Basic Studies in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Isaacs, Harold R.
1975a Idols of the Tribe New York: Harper and Row.
1975b "Basic Group Identity: The Idols of the Tribe." Pp. 29-52 in N. Glazer and D. Moynihan (eds.), Ethnicity - Theory and Experience. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kerlinger, Fred N.
1973 Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kleg, Milton
1970 Race, Caste, and Prejudice: The Influence of Change in Knowledge on Change in Attitude. Unpublished dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.

Murray, Katherine
1977 "'From Immigrant to Ethnic': A Curriculum Package." RIFLA Gazette 2 (Fall): 18-22

Naroll, Raoul
1964 "On Ethnic Unit Classification." Current Anthropology 5 (October): 283-91.

Oppenheim, A.N.
1966 Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Shibutani, Tamotsu and Kian M. Kwan
1965 Ethnic Stratification. London: The MacMillan Co.

Smith, Gary R. and George G. Otero
1977 Teaching About Ethnic Heritage. Ethnic Heritage Series, Volume 1. Denver, Colorado: Center for Teaching International Relations.

Weber, Max
1965 "Ethnic Groups." Pp. 305-9 in T. Parsons, E. Shils, K. Naegele, and J. Pitts (eds.), Theories of Society. New York: Free Press.

II. Dissemination Plan

Based upon input from participating teachers and students, as well as from members of the Advisory Council, the sourcebook and teacher's guide are being revised for dissemination in the metropolitan area of Albany, New York. A list of local schools and other educational associations has been compiled and each school and association on the list will receive complimentary copies of The Individual and Ethnic Identity: A Sourcebook for Students and its companion teachers' guide. A limited number of complete sets will then be available for distribution to schools which request them. Following that, the Junior College of Albany will make sets available at cost.

In addition to the direct dissemination plan of the project, the sourcebook and teachers' guide have been submitted to a national publishing company. Should this company find that the sourcebook and teachers' guide have a market value relative to its needs, the material would become available to a wider audience. In any case, copies are being submitted for inclusion in the ERIC file.

III. Attitude Scale Items

The following twenty items were used for both the pre- and post-test attitude scales. Only their order of inclusion was changed. All of the items were adapted from a scale developed by Milton Kleg in 1970. Students were asked if they (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) are undecided, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree with each item.

1. Members of minority groups lack the ability to learn or achieve very much.
2. If it were not for pushy or uppity ethnic groups, we would not have any social problems.
3. One can tell a person's ethnic heritage from his or her behavior.
4. It is necessary to discriminate to protect our ethnic purity.
5. There are no ethnic personality traits that are inborn or inherited.
6. Prejudice and discrimination can both destroy our society.
7. People with low status in America would have a low status anywhere else.
8. Even if a person has a bad experience with someone of another ethnic group, he or she should not generalize or stereotype.
9. Minority groups are a major cause of crime, since such people are naturally criminal.
10. Americans are the finest people in the world, far above all others.
11. Poor housing conditions are due to the kind of people that live in them.
12. Minority groups in America prefer to live off welfare and not to work.
13. Minority groups in America are usually given the easy jobs.
14. Most people are prejudiced because they have learned that some groups

of people are just no good.

15. The immigration of foreigners to this country should be kept down so that we can provide for Americans first.
16. Minority groups complain about discrimination, but if they'd stop complaining and work hard and save,they could gain higher status as easily as anyone else.
17. There is a superior ethnic group.
18. I have a negative attitude toward certain groups based on facts, not prejudice.
19. Prejudice is an inborn part of human nature.
20. Some stereotyping is necessary to protect us from certain racial or ethnic groups.

JUNIOR COLLEGE OF ALBANY
RUSSELL SAGE COLLEGE
140 NEW SCOTLAND AVENUE
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12208

IV. THE INDIVIDUAL AND ETHNIC IDENTITY

Interview Schedule
Henry H. Brownstein, Ph.D.

Number_____
Date_____

This interview is part of a study to help us to understand how people identify with ethnic groups of common national origin, race, or religion.

I. Do you identify yourself with any particular ethnic group?_____
Do you think that other people generally identify you with that or any other particular ethnic group?_____
(If no, relate questions to family origins.)

II. Family History
Could you tell me anything about how your family originally came to America? (Where did they come from?
Why did they come?
Where did they first settle?
How long have they been here?)

III. Practices
1. Are there any things which you do that are especially related to your being_____? (Explain.)
(e.g., other language spoken; special foods eaten; books, newspapers, or magazines read; holidays celebrated)

2. (If you had children, would they be . . .) Are your children being brought up to identify with your ethnic background? (Explain.)
(e.g., ethnic schools; special celebrations)

IV. Socialization
1. In any special way were you brought up to be _____? (Explain.)
(Role of parents?
Role of others?)
(e.g., schooling; family celebrations; language; newspapers)

2. How would you describe the neighborhood or area in which you grew up?
(Many _____ people; stores; other institutions? languages spoken? cases of discrimination?)
What were the schools like?

V. Networks

1. (Friends) Of the friends with whom you are closest, about how many are _____?
Compared to other friends, about how often do you see your _____ friends?
How important is it to you to have _____ friends? (Explain.)

2. (Co-workers) Of the people with whom you work, are there many _____s?
Are you closer to them than to other co-workers?
How important is it to you to work with other _____s?
(Explain.)

3. (Spouse) (If you were married. . .) Is your spouse _____?
How important is it to you to have a _____ spouse? (Explain.)

4. (Neighborhood or Area) How would you describe the neighborhood or area in which you live today?
Are there many _____ people stores, or other institutions?
How important is it to you to live in an area with other _____ people or institutions?

5. (Organizations) Are you a member of any _____organizations?
(For each . . .)
Why do you (not) belong to this (any) _____organization?
(Why did you join?
How long have you been a member?
Have you ever met any friends through this organization?)

VI. Knowledge

In any way have you ever studied the history of _____ people in America or elsewhere? (Explain.)
Are there any books, movies, television programs, and so on that you have seen or read about _____ people? Which ones?

VII. Feelings

Do you feel any special pride in being a _____-American today?
. . . any shame in being a _____-American today?
Do you have any special feelings about being a _____-American?

VIII. Beliefs

A. Uniqueness

1. Do you believe that _____-Americans are special in any way?
(. . . special destiny?
. . . special role? Explain.)

2. Do you believe there are any advantages to being a _____-American today?
. . . any disadvantages? (Explain.)

B. Commonness of Kind

1. In any way(s) do you believe that _____-Americans are like one another?
. . . different from one another? (Explain.)

2. Do your beliefs in life generally have anything to do with your identification as a _____-American? (Explain).

C. Symbolic Identification

1. Do you believe there is any relationship between being a _____-American and (the nation of) _____?
(How would you describe that relationship?
Have you ever been there?
Do you ever plan to go?
Have you ever considered living there? Explain.)

2. Do you believe there is any relationship between being a _____-American and (the historial event of) _____?
(E.g., Jews-holocaust; Blacks-slavery; others- ask)
How would you describe that relationship?

D. Discrimination and Prejudice

1. Do you believe there is any prejudice or discrimination against _____-Americans today?
When others call you a _____-American, do you believe it is ever meant as an insult? (Explain.)

2. Do you believe that _____-Americans, as individuals, or as a group, are in any special danger in America or in the world today? (Explain.)

IX. Actual Prejudice or Discrimination

1. Have you ever been discriminated against because you are a _____-American?
Do you know of anyone else who has? (Explain.)

2. Have you ever met anyone who is prejudiced against _____-Americans?
What makes you think that this person is (was) prejudiced?

X. Self-Identification

1. About how often do you think of yourself as a _____-American?
What is it that gives you your identity as a _____-American?
When you think of yourself as a _____-American, what do you mean by that?

2. What other groups (in America) do you identify with?
(e.g., age; sex; social class; occupation)
Compared to these other groups, how important is it for you to see yourself as a _____American? (Explain.)

XI. What does it mean to you to be a _____-American today?

XII. Demographics

1. (sex)_____ (M or F)
2. Are you married?_____
3. In what social class would you place yourself?_____
What was the last grade you completed in school?_____
What is your occupation?_____
Would you say your family income is high, middle, or low?_____
4. How old were you on your last birthday?_____

Thank you for your cooperation.

V. Related Papers and Articles

Brownstein, Henry H.

1979 "The Validity of Intensive Interviews: Testing for Adequacy," paper presented at the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Association for Humanist Sociology (AHS), Johnstown, PA, October.

1979 "Ethnic Group and Ethnic Heritage Identities," presented at the Fourth Annual Meeting fo the AHS, Johnstown, PA, October.

1980 "The Intensive Interview as a Humanistic Teaching Tool," paper to be presented at the Fifth Annual Meeting of the AHS, Louisville, KY, October.

Other papers being prepared include an article from this Evaluation Report and a paper on the meaning of ethnicity.

Also suggested by this project was a proposal submitted (February, 1980) to the Office of Education, Citizen Education for Cultural Understanding Program.